REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are currently pending in the application. Claims 26 and 27 have been withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to a non-elected invention. In view of the remarks below, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the June 11, 2007 Office Action.

Rejection Under 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-16 and 18-25 have been rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,277,875 (hereinafter "Holman"). According to the Office Action, Holman allegedly discloses a composition comprising pramipexole dihydrochloride monohydrate and several pharmaceutically-inert excipients in various dosage forms. For the reasons that follow, Applicants traverse this rejection and respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The present invention, as encompassed by the claims, is directed to a *sustained-release* pharmaceutical composition of pramipexole that exhibits: (a) an *in vitro* release profile wherein on average no more than about 20% of the pramipexole is dissolved within 2 hours after placement of the composition in a standard dissolution test; or (b) an *in vivo* pramipexole absorption profile following single dose oral administration to healthy adult humans wherein the time to reach a mean of 20% absorption is greater than about 2 hours and/or the time to reach a mean of 40% absorption is greater than about 4 hours.

Anticipation requires the disclosure in a prior art reference of each and every limitation as set forth in the claim. As suggested in the Office Action, Holman discloses the use of MIRAPEX® — an *immediate release* pramipexole dosage form that needs to be administered three-times-a-day to patients suffering from CNS disorders. There is no disclosure in Holman of a sustained-release pramipexole composition having the claimed *in vitro* release profile of only 20% dissolution after 2 hours or the claimed *in vivo* absorption profile – following single dose administration – wherein the time to reach a mean of 20% absorption is greater than about 2 hours and/or the time to reach a mean of 40% absorption is greater than about 4 hours. Accordingly, the presently claimed sustained-release compositions cannot be anticipated by Holman.

According to the Office Action, however, the release/absorption profile claimed by the present invention has not been given any patentable weight because it is alleged that the

MIRAPEX® tablets described in Holman are capable of performing the "intended use" (i.e., the sustained release / absorption profile) of the presently claimed invention. This, however, is not the case. Rather, as set forth in the pertinent sections of the Physician's Desk Reference (attached hereto), MIRAPEX® "is *rapidly* absorbed" and "reach[es] *peak* concentrations in approximately 2 hours." *See* Physicians Desk Reference 54th Edition, at p. 2468 (emphasis added). Thus, contrary to the allegation in the Office Action, MIRAPEX® does not, and cannot, reach a pramipexole concentration of only about 20% after 2 hours (and only 40% after 4 hours) following administration. Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn.

Rejection For Alleged Double Patenting

In addition, Claims 1-16, and 18-25 have been provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-23 of copending Application Serial No. 10/626,166 ("the '166 Application"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. More particularly, the claims of present application and those of the copending '166 Application are patentably distinct from each other. As set forth above, the claims of the present invention are directed to sustained-release pramipexole compositions that exhibit a particular "in vitro release profile" and "in vivo absorption profile." But, as stated in the Office Action, such claim limitations were not afforded any "patentable weight," and therefore, improperly ignored. The claims of the '166 Application are directed to particular pramipexole compositions that comprise, inter alia, a starch having a particular tensile strength. The claims of present application do not require the inclusion of the starch limitation; accordingly, contrary to the allegations contained in the Office Action, such claims are patentably distinct over those in the '166 Application. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Rejection Under 35 USC § 103(a) Of Claims

Claim 17 has been rejected as allegedly being obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Holman, discussed <u>supra</u>, in view of United States Patent No. 3,845,770 to Theeuwes et al. (hereinafter, "Theeuwes"). More particularly, the Office Action alleges that Theeuwes teaches the use of an osmotic pump to dispense a composition at a controlled rate.

In response, Applicants submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection. To

establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to combine the references. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the prior art, when combined, must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations.

In the present situation, it is respectfully submitted that the above criteria have not been established. First, there is no suggestion or motivation to combine the disclosure of Holman with that of Theeuwes. As discussed above, Holman discloses the use of MIRAPEX®, *orally*-administrable *immediate* release versions of pramipexole, for the treatment of fibromyalgia. Holman contains no teaching or suggestion, much less disclosure, of the need or desire for the sustained-release of pramipexole when treating fibromyalgia. Theeuwes, moreover, does not supply the missing teaching. Rather, Theeuwes discloses an osmotic drug delivery *device* for *insertion* into the eye: "[t]he novel osmotic drug delivery device of this invention is designed for insertion in the cul-de-sac of the conjunctiva between [the] sclera of [the] eyeball and upper eyelid . . . or [a] device . . . for positioning in the cul-de-sac of the conjunctiva between [the] sclera of [the] eyeball and lower eyelid, generally to be held in drug administration position by the natural pressure of the respective eyelid." (Theeuwes, Col. 7, lines 43-51). Thus, the very differences in the types of active agents described therein, their desired routes of administration, and their respective indications clearly suggest a *lack* of motivation to combine Theeuwes with Holman.

Nevertheless, even if some alleged motivation to combine the two references could be found in the prior art, the resulting combination would not – and could not – teach or suggest each of the claimed limitations of the present invention. As stated above, the prior art citations to MIRAPEX® do not teach or suggest the claimed sustained-release, once-daily pramipexole compositions, much less those having the particular *in vitro* release profile and *in vivo* absorption profile claimed herein. Rather, Holman suggests using an immediate-release pramipexole dosage form that needs to be administered three-times-a-day to patients suffering from CNS disorders to treat fibromyalgia. In this regard, neither reference teaches or suggests a pramipexole composition having: (a) an *in vitro* release profile wherein on average no more than about 20% of the pramipexole is dissolved within 2 hours after placement of the composition in a standard dissolution test; or (b) an *in vivo* pramipexole absorption profile following single dose oral administration to healthy adult humans wherein the time to reach a mean of 20% absorption is greater than about 2 hours and/or the time to reach a mean of 40% absorption is greater than

about 4 hours. Indeed, the Office Action does not point to any particular disclosure in either of the cited references that would contradict this point.

Consequently, the rejection is based merely on the theory that a sustained-release dosage form of pramipexole could be obtained because technology to delay drug release – in particular, the osmotic delivery device of Theeuwes – is generally known in the art. That, however, is neither the standard for determining obviousness; nor is it accurate in the context of the present invention. The present invention enables the dosing of pramipexole – a highly-water soluble drug – to be reduced from three-times-a-day to once-a-day. Thus, the present invention provides the same overall drug exposure as MIRAPEX®, while reducing fluctuations between peak and trough blood drug concentrations. The reduced dosing facilitated by the present invention promotes patient compliance. Indeed, as set forth in the present application, "[t]he primary indication for [pramipexole], Parkinson's disease, is an affliction that becomes more prevalent with advancing age and is often accompanied by decline in memory. *See* Present Application at ¶ [0004]. Thus, "[a] once-daily regimen would be especially useful in enhancing compliance among elderly patients." *See id*.

Finally, the rejection ignores the well-established principle that the development of a sustained-release formulation for any particular drug is highly compound-specific. Thus, contrary to the allegation contained in the Office Action, methods of achieving the sustained release of one compound are not predictive of success with another compound possessing different chemical properties. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would find no motivation to combine or modify (or both) the teachings of the prior art to arrive at the claimed invention - particularly in view of the highly unique characteristics of pramipexole, which make it difficult to formulate it as a sustained-release dosage form. Indeed, as set forth in the present application, pramipexole is highly soluble in water (about 200 mg/ml at 225°C). Highly watersoluble drugs, such as those with a solubility of about 10 mg/ml or greater, present challenges to the formulator wishing to provide a sustained-release dosage form, and the higher the solubility the greater are the challenges. These challenges are well illustrated in the case of pramipexole "because of the tendency of the drug to rapidly leach out of the dosage form upon exposure to an aqueous medium, such as gastrointestinal fluid." See Present Application at ¶ [0025]. Because the teachings of the cited references provide no guidance regarding how to formulate a highly water soluble drug, such as pramipexole, into a sustained-release dosage form, the citations cannot render the claimed invention obvious. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 17 as allegedly obvious over Holman in view of Theeuwes be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the remarks above, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are fully allowable, and solicit the issuance of a notice to such effect. If a telephone interview is deemed to be helpful to expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned attorneys at the telephone number provided.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees required or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 16-1445.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 7, 2007

John C. Martin Reg. No. 42,843

Pfizer Inc.
Patent Department, 5th Floor
150 East 42nd Street
New York, NY 10017-5755
(212) 733-0538



www.pdr.net

PHYSICIANS DESK REFERENCE

æ a the ch-

3. Type I diabetes mellitus, as ode desage SPECIAL WARNING ON INCREAMENTS OF A SPECIAL WARNING ON INCREAMENTS.

The administration of oral hypoghy som 6

term prospective clinical trial designed is §the fectiveness of glucose-lowering drugs e medialying vascular complications in patients (the patients) of the fectiveness of the fectiven

Uniported, 19 (Suppl. 2)(1/4)-asu, (1/4) UGDP reported that patients treated to 1 a find diet plus a fixed dose of tolbutanude (1) a fixed dose of tolbutanude (1) and had a rate of cardiovascular mortality equipite times that of patients treated with the same to

ncrease in total mortality was not observed the observed the observed of the observed on the best of the observed on the o

diovascular mortality, thus limiting the open study to show an increase in overall mortality

troversy regarding the interpretation of thing of findings of the UGDP study provide an exhaust this warning. The patient should be intermed that risks and advantages of MICRONASI are at

Modes of therapy.
Although only one drug in the sulfanylines drug
mide) was included in this study, it is profess first
standpoint to consider that this warming may
the other oral hypotyleomic drugs in this class is di
close similarities in mode of action and chemical

vere hypoglycemia. Proper patient of teles of all instructions are important to avoid brooking des. Renal or hepatic insufficiency to the up to the patient of the patient ia: All sulfonylureus are справае,

drug levels of glyburide and the latter reason

gluconeogenic capacity, both of which means the rious hypoglycemic reactions. Elderly, debated nourished patients, and those with adversion sufficiency, are particularly susceptible to the best sufficiency, are particularly susceptible to the best section of glucose-lowering drugs. Hypoglycose facult to recognize in the elderly and to people ship ing both-adrenergic blocking drugs. Hypoglycose ship ing both-adrenergic blocking drugs.

induction to recognize in the elderly and in people shifting beta-affenencie blocking drugs. The some likely to occur when caloric intake is determined for prolonged exercise, when alcohol extraction more than one glucose lowering drug to as the hypoglycemia may be increased with conductable.

Loss of Control of Blood Glucose: What spells lized on any diabetic regimen is exposed to steed fever, trauma, infection or surgery, a least sense.

The effectiveness of any hypoglycoma de a tel

cur. At such times it may be necessary to MICRONASE and administer insulin.

PRECAUTIONS

Hypoglycen

and instru

reported to be associated with mirror mortality as compared to treatment with the plus insulin. This warning is based on the start by the University Group Diabetes Program interm prospective clinical trial designed as a pro-

DIOVASCULAR MORTALITY

/a-·ly ib-

decreases in many patients over a period of the a site be due to progression of the severity of dialected as to enue to progression of the severity of database at sished responsiveness to the drug. The chosend known as secondary failure, to distinguish a form failure in which the drug is ineffective in an admention them MICRONASE is first given. Maquelle ment of dose and adherence to diet should be found in the form classificing a patient. ment of dose and adherence to diet should to fore classifying a patient as a secondary todose

the classifying a patient as a secondary father the potential risks and advantages of Millers and alternative modes of therapy. They also should be about the importance of adherence to dictars modes of a regular exercise program, and of reputs which with a result of a regular exercise program, and of reputs which with a risk of the melboomie it is among the risk of the risks of the melboomie it is among the risk of the risks of th The risks of hypoglycemia, its symptoms and to conditions that predispose to its development

explained to patients and responsible family needs mary and secondary failure also should be explain Laboratory Tests

Therapeutic response to MICRONASE Tablets also els may be helpful in some patients

monitored by frequent urine glucose tests and partial glucose tests. Measurement of glycosylated hemotolic

hypoglycemic action of sulfonvlumes medated by certain drugs including nonsteroidal ant story agents and other drugs that are highly notes resalicy lates, sulfonamides, chloramphenicol, protesset marins, monoamine oxidase inhibitors, and beta usblocking agents. When such drugs are administrate tient receiving MICRONASE, the patient should served closely for hypoglycemia. When such drugs as given by the such drugs as given by drawn from a patient receiving MICRONASE, as should be observed closely for loss of control.

Certain drugs tend to produce hyperglycemia and to loss of control. These drugs include the thuse other diuretics, corticosteroids, phenothiazing a products, estrogens, oral contraceptives, phonothiazine as tinic acid, sympathomimetics, calcium channel drugs, and isoniazid. When such drugs are admissed a patient receiving MICRONASE, the patient aclosely observed for loss of control. When such withdrawn from a patient receiving MICRONASI tient should be observed closely for hypoglycerais oglycemic action of glyburide. The tion is not known.

ation is not known.

etween oral miconazole and oral
along to severe hypoglycemia has
the interaction also occurs with the
orinal preparations of miconazole

dose interaction study in NIDDM vburide AUC and C_{max} were obviousle. The single-dose nature of of correlation between gly andynamic effects, makes the clinileraction uncertain. Coadministrametformin did not result in any omin pharmacokinetics or pharma-

penesis, and Impairment of Fertility
up to 300 mg/kg/day for 1S months
effects. Glyburide is nonmutagenic nella microsome test (Ames Alkaline elution assay. No drug reor study of glyburide in mice.

Pregnancy Category B have been performed in rats and rab-times the human dose and have re-impaired fertility or harm to the fetus are, however, no adequate and well megnant women. Because animal re-not always predictive of human re-odd be used during pregnancy only if

nation suggests that abnormal blood aution suggests that abnormal blood pregnancy are associated with a onemital abnormalities, many experts in be used during pregnancy to main-duse to normal as possible.

Prolonged severe hypoglycemia · reported in neonates born to mothers ulfonylurea drug at the time of deliv parted more frequently with the use of all half-lives. If MICRONASE is used hould be discontinued at least two pected delivery date.

mown whether glyburide is excreted in affonylurea drugs are known to be exone nursing or to discontinue the drug, in the importance of the drug to the sidesontinued, and if diet alone is inolling blood glucose, insulin therapy

oness in pediatric patients have not been

... Precautions and Overdosage Sections.
... O Reactions: mirmalities, including isolated transami-

we been reported.

h turbances, eg, nausea, epigastric full-m are the most common reactions, having of treated patients during clinical trials. related and may disappear when dos-

actions: Allergic skin reactions, eg, pruri-Atternation and morbilliform or maculopap-curred in 1.5% of treated patients during test may be transient and may disappear at use of MICRONASE; if skin reactions hould be discontinued.

men tarda and photosensitivity reactions d with sulfonylureas.

Leukopenia, agranulory Reactions: Leukopenia, agrandic ytosis, in hemolytic anemia, aplastic anemia, and one been reported with sulfonylureas.

we been reported with sultonylureas, saturns: Hepatic porphyria and disulfiram-have been reported with sulfonylureas; the porphyria has not been reported with and disulfiram-like reactions have been re-

miremia have been reported with glyburide dionylureas, most often in patients who are tions or have medical conditions known to tions or have medical conditions known to the control of increase release of antidiurctic horself of the control of the contro

dermatologic reactions, allergic reactions dema, arthralgia, myalgia and vasculitis parted.

lets, can produce hypoglycemia. Mild hypoglycemic symptoms, without loss of consciousness or neurological findings, should be treated aggressively with oral glucose and adjustments in drug dosage and/or meal patterns. Close monitoring should continue until the physician is assured that the patient is a figure of the program benefits and the patients in the figure. Somethous description is a surface with ing should continue until the physician is assured that the patient is out of danger. Severe hypoglycemic reactions with coma, seizure, or other neurological impairment occur infrequently, but constitute medical emergencies requiring immediate hospitalization. If hypoglycemic coma is diagnosed or suspected, the patient should be given a rapid intravenous injection of concentrated (50%) glucose solution. This should be followed by a continuous infusion of a more dilute (10%) glucose solution at a rate which will maintain the blood glucose at a level above 100 mg/dL. Patients should be closely monitored for a minimum of 24 to 48 hours, since hypoglycemia may recur after apparent clinical recovery.

DOSAGE AND ADMINISTRATION

There is no fixed dosage regimen for the management of abetes mellitus with MICRONASE Tablets or any other agences memous with microstonab langers or any other ny-poglycemic agent. In addition to the usual monitoring of uri-nary glucose, the patient's blood glucose must also be mon-itored periodically to determine the minimum effective dose for the patient; to detect primary failure, ie, inadequate low ering of blood glucose at the maximum recommended dost ering of blood glucose at the maximum recommended dose of medication; and to detect secondary failure, ie, lose of ad-equate blood glucose lowering response after an initial pe-riod of effectiveness. Glycosylated hemoglobin levels may also be of value in monitoring the patient's response to ther

Short-term administration of MICRONASE may be suffi-cient during periods of transient loss of control in patients sually controlled well on diet.

Usual Starting Dose

The usual starting dose of MICRONASE Tablets is 2.5 to 5 mg daily, administered with breakfast or the first main mg daily, administered with breaktast or the bypogly-meal. Those patients who may be more sensitive to hypogly-cemic drugs should be started at 1.25 mg daily. (See PRE-CAUTIONS section for patients at increased risk.) Failure to follow an appropriate dosage regimen may precipitate by-poglycemia. Patients who do not adhere to their prescribed properties of the property of the property of the pro-position of the property of the property of the pro-position of the property of the property of the pro-position of the property of the property of the pro-position of the property of the property of the pro-position of the property of the property of the property of the pro-position of the property of the property of the property of the pro-position of the property of t poglycemia. ry and drug regimen are more prone to exhibit unsat-

poglycemia. Fatients who to include the charkers of each bit unsatisfactory response to therapy.

Transfer From Other Hypoglycemic Therapy Patients Reciving Other Oral Antidiabetic Therapy. Transfer of patients from other oral antidiabetic regimens to MICRONASE, should be 2.5 to 5 mg. When transferring patients from oral hypoglycemic agents other than chlorpropamide to MICRONASE, no transition period and no initial or priming does are necessary. When transferring patients from first two weeks because the prolonged retention of chlorpropamide, particular care should be exercised during the first two weeks because the prolonged retention of chlorpropamide in the body and subsequent overlapping drug effects may provoke hypoglycemia.

Patients Receiving insulin: Some Type II diabetic patients being treated with insulin may respond satisfactorily to MICRONASE, if the insulin dose is less than 20 units daily, substitution of MICRONASE Tablets 2.5 to 5 mg as a single daily dose may be tried. If the insulin dose is between 20 daily dose may be tried. If the insulin dose is between 20 daily dose may be tried. If the insulin dose is between 20 daily dose may be tried. If the insulin dose is between 20 daily dose may be tried. If the patient may be placed directly on

substitution of MICRONASE Tablets 2.5 to 5 mg as a single daily dose may be tried. If the insulin dose is between 20 and 40 units daily, the patient may be placed directly on MICRONASE Tablets 5 mg daily as a single dose. If the insulin dose is more than 40 units daily, a transition period is required for conversion to MICRONASE. In these patients, insulin dosage is decreased by 50% and MICRONASE Tablets 5 mg daily is started. Please refer to Titration to Maintenance Dose for further explanation.

Itration to Maintenance Dose

tenance Dose for further explanation.

Thration to Maintenance Dose
The usual maintenance dose is in the range of 1.25 to 20 mg
daily, which may be given as a single dose or in divided
doses (See Dosage Interval section). Dosage increases
should be made in increase the nationals blood glucose reweekly intervals based upon the patient's blood glucose re-

No exact dosage relationship exists between MICRONASE and the other oral hypoglycemic agents. Although pati-may be transferred from the maximum dose of other s may be transferred from the maximum dose of other sulfonylureas, the maximum starting dose of 5 mg of MICRON-ASE Tablets should be observed. A maintenance dose of 5 mg of MICRONASE Tablets provides approximately the same degree of blood glucose control as 250 to 375 mg chlor-propanide, 250 to 375 mg tolazanide, 500 to 750 mg aceto-beamide or 1000 to 15 00 me tolbutemide. ide, or 1000 to 15 00 mg tolbutamide.

hexamide, or 1000 to 15 00 mg tolbutamide. When transferring patients receiving more than 40 units of insulin daily, they may be started on a daily dose of MICKONASE Tablets 5 mg concomitantly with a 50% reduction in insulin dose. Progressive withdrawal of insulin and increase of MICRONASE in increments of 1.25 to 2.5 mg every 2 to 10 days is then carried out. During this conversion period when both insulin and MICRONASE are being used, hypoglycemia may rarely occur. During insulin withdrawal, patients should test their urine for glucese and acutone at least three times daily and report results to their withdrawai, patients should test their urine for glucose and acetone at least three times daily and report results to their physician. The appearance of persistent acetonuria with glycosuria indicates that the patient is a Type I diabetic who

requires insulin therapy.

Concomitant Glyburide and Metformin Therapy

MICRONASE Tablets should be added gradually to the dosing regimen of patients who have not responded to the maxing regimen of patients who have not responded to the man-imum dose of metformin monotherapy after four weeks (see Usual Starting Dose and Titration to Maintenance Dose). Refer to metformin package insert.

identify the optimal dose of each drug needed to action a goal. With concomitant glyburide and metformin therapy, the risk of hypoglycemia associated with sulfonylurea therapy. e tisk or hypoglycentia associated with sunonyltrea thereby continues and may be increased. Appropriate precausins should be taken (see PRECAUTIONS section).

Maximum Dose

Daily doses of more than 20 mg are not recommended.

Dosage interval Once-a-day ther Once-day therapy is usually satisfactory. Some patients, particularly those receiving more than 10 mg daily, may have a more satisfactory response with twice-a-day dosage.

MICRONASE is not recommended for use in pregnancy or

SHICKUNASE is not recommended for use in pregnancy or for use in pediatric patients. In elderly patients, debilitated or mainourished patients, and patients with impaired renal or hepatic function, the initial and maintenance dosing should be conservative to avoid hypolgycemic reactions, (See PRECAUTIONS section.) tion.)

HOW SUPPLIED

MICRONASE Tablets are supplied as follows:
MICRONASE Tablets 1.25 mg (White, Round, Scored, imprinted MICRONASE 1.25)

NDC 0009-0131-01 MICRONASE Tablets 2.5 mg (Dark Pink. Round, Scored, imprinted MICRONASE 2.5)
Bottles of 100
NDC 0009-0141-01 tttee of 100

Bottles of 1000 NDC 0009-0141-02 Unit Dose Pkg of 100
Unit Dose Pkg of 100
MDC 0009-0141-02
MICRONASE Tablets 5 mg (Blue, Round, Scored imprinted MICRONASE 5)

NDC 0009-0171-11

NDC 0009-0171-11 Bottles of 30 NDC 0009-0171-12 NDC 0009-0171-05 Bottles of 60 NDC 0009-0171-06 NDC 0009-0171-07 NDC 0009-0171-03 Bottles of 50 Bottles of 1000 Unit Dose Pkg of 100

Ontr Dose 1 sg. or 1982

Nat only
Store at controlled room temperature 20° to 25°C (68° to 77°F) [see USP]. Dispensed in well closed containers with safety closures. Keep container tightly closed.

Pharmacia & Upjohn Company
Kalamacia o, M1 49001. USA

811 985 722

Revised February 1999

811 985 722

MIRAPEX®

(mir-a-pex) pramipexole dihydrochloride tablets

DESCRIPTION

MIRAPEX Tablets contain pramipexole, a dopamine agonist MIRAPEX Tablets contain pramipexale, a dopamine agonist indicated for the treatment of the signs and symptoms of diopathic Parkinson's disease. The chemical name of pramipexale dihydrochloride is (S1-2-amino-4,5-6,7-tetraby-dro-6-(propylamino)benzothiazule dihydrochloride monohydrate. Its empirical formula is C₁₀H₁₇N₃S • 2 HCl • H₂O, and its molecular weight is 302.27. The structural formula is:

Pramipexole dihydrochloride is a white to off white powder substance. Melting occurs in the range of 296° C to 301° C, with decemposition. Pramipexole dihydrochloride is more than 20% soluble in water, about 8% in methanol, about 0.5% in ethanol, and practically insoluble in dichlocathors.

romethane.

MIRAPEX Tablets, for oral administration. contain 0.125
mg, 0.25 mg, 0.5 mg, 1.0 mg, or 1.5 mg of pramipexole dihydrochloride monohydrate. Inactive ingredients consist of
mannitol, corn starch, colloidal silicon dioxide, povidone, and magnesium stearate

CLINICAL PHARMACOLOGY

CLINICAL PHARMACOLOGY
Pramipexole is a nonergot dopumine agonist with high relative in vitro specificity and full intrinsic activity at the D_c subfamily of dopamine receptors, binding with higher affinity to D_c than to D_c or D_c receptor subtypes. The relevance of D_c receptor binding in Parkinson's disease is unknown. The precise mechanism of action of pramipexole as a treatment for Parkinson's disease is unknown, although it is believed to be related to its ability to stimulate dopamine receptors in the striatum. This conclusion is supported by electrophysiologic studies in animals that have demonstrated. electrophysiologic studies in animals that have demon

Continued on next page

Information on these Pharmacia & Upjohn products is based Information on these Pharmacia & Upjohn products is based on labeling in effect June 1, 1993. Further information concerning these and other Pharmacia & Upjohn products may be obtained by direct inquiry to Medical Information, Pharmacia & Upjohn, Kalamazoo, Mi 49001.

Consult 2000 PDR: supplements and future editions for revisions

Miranex-Cont.

strated that pramipexole influences striatal neuronal firing rates via activation of dopamine receptors in the striatum and the substantia nigra, the site of neurons that send projections to the striatum.

Pramipexole is rapidly absorbed, reaching peak concentra in approximately 2 hours. The absolute bioavailability tions in approximately 2 hours. The assolute bload-mainly of pramipexole is greater than 90%, indicating that it is well absorbed and undergoes little presystemic metabolism. Food does not affect the extent of pramipexole absorption, although the time of maximum plasma concentration (T_{max}) is increased by about 1 hour when the drug is taken with a

meal. Pramipexole is extensively distributed, having a volume of distribution of about 500 L (coefficient of variation [CV]=20%). It is about 15% bound to plasma proteins. Pramipexole distributes into red blood cells as indicated by an erythrecyte-to-plasma ratio of approximately 2. Pramipexole displays linear pharmacokinetics over the discal dosage range. Its terminal half-life is about 8 hours in young healthy volunteers and about 12 hours in elderly volunteers (see CLINICAL PHARMACOLOGY, Pharmacokinetics in Special Panulations, Steady state concentrations

unteers (see CLINICAL PHARMACOLOGY, Pharmacokinetics in Special Populations, Steady-state concentrations are achieved within 2 days of dosing.

Metabolism and elimination: Urinary excretion is the major route of pramipexole elimination, with 90% of a pramipexole dose recovered in urine, almost all as unchanged drug. Nonrenal routes may contribute to a small extent to pramipexole elimination, although no metabolites have been identified in plasma or urine. The renal clearance of pramipexole is approximately 400 ml/min (CV-25%), approximately three times higher than the glomerular filtration rate. Thus, pramipexole is secreted by the renal tu-

proximately three times higher than the glomerular filtra-tion rate. Thus, pramipexole is secreted by the renal tu-bules, probably by the organic cation transport system. Pharmacokinetics in Special Populations Because therapy with pramipexole is initiated at a sub-therapeutic dosage and gradually titrated upward according to clinical tolerability to obtain the optimum therapeutic ef-fect, adjustment of the initial dose based on gender, weight, or ago is not necessary. However, renal insufficiency, which can cause a large decrease in the ability to eliminate prami-pexole, may necessitate dosage adjustment (see CLINICAL pexole, may necessitate dosage adjustment (see CLINICAL PHARMACOLOGY, Renal Insufficiency).

Gender: Pramipexole clearance is about 30% lower in women than in men, but most of this difference can be accounted for by differences in body weight. There is no difference in half-life between males and females.

ence in nail-life between mains and termines.

Age: Pramipexole clearance decreases with age as the half-life and clearance are about 40% longer and 30% lower, respectively, in elderly (aged 65 years or older) compared with young healthy volunteers (aged less than 40 years). This difference is most likely due to the well-known reduction in renal function with age, since pramipexole clearance is correlated with renal function, as measured by creatinine clearance (see CLINICAL PHARMACOLOGY, Renal Insuf-

ficiency). Parkinson's disease patients: A cross-study comparison of data suggests that the clearance of pramipexole may be reduced by about 30% in Parkinson's disease patients compared with healthy elderly volunteers. The reason for this difference appears to be reduced renal function in Parkinson's disease patients, which may be related to their poorer general health. The pharmacokinetics of pramipexole were comparable between early and advanced Parkinson's disease actions. ease patients.

Pediatric: The pharmacokinetics of pramipexole in the pe

Pediatric: The pharmacokinetics of pramipexole in the pediatric population have not been evaluated.

Hepatic Insufficiency: The influence of hepatic insufficiency on pramipexole pharmacokinetics have not been evaluated. Because approximately 90% of the recovered dose is excreted in the urine as unchanged drug, hepatic impairment would not be expected to have a significant effect on pramipexole elimination.

Beat Insufficiency: The clearance of pramipexole was

of insufficiency: The clearance of pramipexole was about 75% lower in patients with severe renal impairment (creatinine clearance approximately 20 mL/min) and about 60% lower in patients with moderate impairment (creating 60% lower in patients with moderate impairment creation into clearance approximately 40 mL/min) compared with healthy volunteers. A lower starting and maintenance dose is recommended in these patients (see PRECAUTIONS and DOSAGE AND ADMINISTRATION). In patients with vary-ing degrees of renal impairment, pramipexole clearance cor-relates well with creatinine clearance. Therefore, creatinine relates well with creatinine clearance. Therefore, creatinine clearance can be used as a predictor of the extent of decrease in pramipexole clearance. Pramipexole clearance is extremely low in dialysis patients, as a negligible amount of pramipexole is removed by dialysis. Caution should be exercised when administering pramipexole to patients with renal disease.

CLINICAL STUDIES

The effectiveness of MIRAPEX Tablets in the treatment of Parkinson's disease was evaluated in a multinational dradevelopment program of seven randomized, controlled trials. Three were conducted in patients with early Parkinals. Three were conducted in patients with early rarkin-son's disease who were not receiving concomitant levodopa, and four were conducted in patients with advanced Parkin-son's disease who were receiving concomitant levodopa. Among these seven studies, three studies provide the most persuasive evidence of pramipexole's effectiveness in the management of patients with Parkinson's disease who were were not receiving concomitant levodopa. Two of these

three trials enrolled patients with early Parkinson's disease (not receiving levodopa), and one enrolled patients with advanced Parkinson's disease who were receiving maximally tolerated doses of levodopa. In all studies, the Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale (UPDRS), or one or more of its subparts, served as the primary outcome assessment measure. The UPDRS is a four-part multi-item rating scale intended to evaluate mentation (part I), activities of daily living (part II), motor performance (part III), and complications of therapy (part IV). Part II of the UPDRS contains 13 questions relating to activities of daily living (ADL), which are scored from 0 (normal) to 4 (maximal severity) for a maximum (worst) score of 52. Part III of the UPDRS contains 27 questions (for 14 items) and is scored as described for part II. It is designed to assess the severity of the cardinal motor findings in patients with Parkinson's disease (e.g. tremor, rigidity, bradykinesia),

assess the severity of the cardinal motor indings in patients with Parkinson's disease (e.g. tremp. rigidity, bradykinesia), postural instability, etc.), scored for different body regions, and has a maximum (worst) score of 108.

Studies in Patients With Early Parkinson's Disease Patients (N-559) in the two studies of early Parkinson's disease had a mean disease duration of 2 years, limited or no prior exposure to levodopa (generally none in the preceding 6 months), and were not experiencing the "on-off" phenomenon and dyskinesia characteristic of later stages of the disease.

ease.
One of the two early Parkinson's disease studies (N=335) was a double-blind, placebo-controlled, parallel trial consisting of a 7-week dose-escalation period and a 6-month maintenance period. Patients could be on selegiline, anticholinergics, or both, but could not be levedopa products or amantadine. Patients were randomized to MIRAPEX or placebo. Patients treated with MIRAPEX had a starting daily dose of 0.375 mg and were titrated to maximally tolerated dose, but no bisher than 4.5 me/day in three divided doses. At the end 0.375 mg and were titrated to maximally tolerated dose, but no higher than 4.5 mg/day in three divided doses. At the end of the 6-month maintenance period, the mean improvement from baseline on the UPDRS part II (ADL) total score was 1.9 in the group receiving MIRAPEX and 0.4 in the placebo group, a difference that a was statistically significant. The mean improvement from baseline on the UPDRS part II total score was 5.0 in the group receiving MIRAPEX and -0.8 in the placebo group, a difference that was also statistically significant. A statistically significant difference between groups in favor of MIRAPEX was seen beginning at week 2 of the UPDRS part II (maximum dose 0.75 mg/day) and at week 3 of the UPDRS part III (maximum dose 1.5 and at week 3 of the UPDRS part III (maximum dose 1.5

mg/day). The secon ond early Parkinson's disease study (N=264) was a double-blind, placebo-controlled, parallel trial consisting of a 6-week dose-escalation period a 4-week maintenance priod. Patients could be on selegiline, anticholinergies, amantadine, or any combination of these, but could not be on tadine, or any combination of these, but could not be on levodpap products. Patients were randomized to 1 of 4 fixed doses of MIRAPEX (1.5 mg 3.0 mg, 4.5 mg, or 6.0 mg per day) or placebo. At the end of the 4-week maintenance period, the mean improvement from baseline on the UPDRS part II total score was 1.8 in the patients treated with MIRAPEX, regardless of assigned dose group, and 0.3 in placebo-treated patients. The mean improvement from baseline on the UPDRS part III total score was 4.2 in patients treated with MIRAPEX and 0.6 in placebo-treated patients. No dose response relationship was demonstrated. tients. No dose-response relationship was demonstrated.
The between-treatment differences on both parts of the UP-DRS were statistically significant in favor of MIRAPEX for

No differences in effectiveness based on age or ge detected. There were too few non-Caucasian patients to evaluate the effect of race. Patients receiving selegiline or anticholinergies had responses similar to patients not re-

evaluate the effect of race. Patients receiving selegiline or naticholinergics had responses similar to patients not receiving these drugs.

Studies in Patients With Advanced Parkinson's Disease
In the advanced Parkinson's disease study, the primary assessments were the UPDRS and daily diaries that quantified amounts of 'on' and 'off' time.

Patients in the advanced Parkinson's disease study (N=360) had a mean disease duration of 9 years, had been exposed to levedopa for long periods of time (mean 8 years), used concomitant levedopa during the trial, and had 'on-off' periods. The advanced Parkinson's disease study was a double-blind, placebo-controlled, parallel trial consisting of a 7-week dose-scalation period and a 6-month maintenance period. Patients were all treated with concomitant levedopa products and could additionally be on concomitant selegiline, anticholinergies, amantadine, or any combination. Patients treated with MIRAPEX had a starting dose of 0.375 mg/day and were titrated to a maximally tolerated dose, but no higher than 4.5 mg/day in three divided doses. At selected times during the 6-month maintenance period, patients were asked to record the amount of 'off,' 'on,' or 'on with dyskinesia' time per day for several sequential days. At the end of the 6-month maintenance period, the mean improvement from baseline on the UPDRS part III total score was 2.7 in the group treated with MIRAPEX and 0.5 in the placebo group, a difference that was statistically significant. The mean improvement from baseline on the UPDRS part III total score was 5.6 in the group treated with MIRAPEX and 2.8 in the placebo group, a difference that was statistically satisficant. The mean improvement from baseline on the UPDRS part III total score was 5.6 in the group treated with MIRAPEX and 2.8 in the placebo group, a difference that was statistically significant. A statistically significant difference between groups in favor of MIRAPEX was seen at week 3 of the UPDRS part II (maximum dose 1.5 mg/day) and at week 2 of the UPDRS part III (maximum dose 0.75 mg/day). Dosage reduction of levodope was allowed during this study if dyskinesia (or hallucinations) developed; levodopa dosage reduction occurred in 76% of patients treated with MIRAPEX versus 54% of placebo patients. On average, the levodopa dose was reduced 27%.

The mean number of "off" hours per day during The mean number of 'off' hours per day during was 6 hours for both treatment groups. Throug trial, patients treated with MIRAPEX had a mean hours per day, while placebo-treated patients consequences 6 'off' hours per day.

No differences in effectiveness based on age or great the consequence of th . Through

detected. There were too few non-Caucasian pate evaluate the effect of race.

INDICATIONS AND USAGE

MIRAPEX Tablets are indicated for the treatment signs and symptoms of idiopathic Parkinson's due. The effectiveness of MIRAPEX was demonstrated. domized, controlled trials in patients with early l'a disease who were not receiving concomitant level apy as well as in patients with advanced di-itant levodopa (see CLINICAL STUDIES).

CONTRAINDICATIONS

MIRAPEX Tablets are contraindicated in patient demonstrated hypersensitivity to the drug or like

WARNINGS

WARNINGS
Symptomatic Hypotension: Dopamine agonista, studies and clinical experience, appear to impatemic regulation of blood pressure, with result static hypotension, especially during dose escale kinson's disease patients, in addition, appear to be kinson's discase patients, in addition, appear to a paired capacity to respond to an orthostatic that these reasons, Parkinson's disease patients be with dopaminergic agonists ordinarily require the toring for signs and symptoms of orthostatic sespecially during dose escalation, and should be this risk (see PRECAUTIONS, Information but, une rase used FIRELAUTIUMS, Information but in clinical trials for pramipexole, however, and orthostatic effects in normal volunteers, the radence of clinically significant orthostatic hyps not greater among those assigned to MIMAI than among those assigned to placebo. This requirement of the previous experience and formating against thereau.

of dopamine agonist therapy.

While this finding could reflect a unique properties, it might also be explained by the rote study and the nature of the population corollary. ical trials. Patients were very carefully (its tients with active cardiovascular disease of thostatic hypotension at baseline were cults. Hallucinations: In the three double-bline. relief trials in early Parkinson's discourse were observed in 9% (35 of 388) of pat MIRAPEX, compared with 2.6% (6 of 235) of ing placebo. In the four double-blind, place als in advanced Parkinson's disease, wh ceived MIRAPEX and concomitant levelence were observed in 16.5% (43 of 260) of pt MIRAPEX compared with 3.8% (10 of 28 ceiving placebo. Hallucinations were of set cause discontinuation of treatment in 3 1 kinson's disease patients and 2.7% of the son's disease patients compared with alter patients in both populations.

patients in both populations.
Age appears to increase the risk of haliable to pramipexole. In the early l'artitients, the risk of hallucinations was 1.9 placebo in patients younger than 65 greater than placebo in patients older advanced Parkinson's disease putients, nations was 3.5 times greater than younger than 65 years and 5.2 times greater than patients older than 65 years.

PRECAUTIONS

Rhabdomyolysis: A single case of curred in a 49-year-old male with adverses treated with MIRAPEX Tublets pitalized with an elevated CPK (10. ms resolved with discontinuation 🕊 Renal: Since pramipexole through should be exercised when prescribing with renal insufficiency (see DOSAC).

Dyskinesia: MIRAPEX may potentially side effects of levodopa and may rationally dyskinesia. Decreasing the definition of the statement of the definition of the statement of the this side effect.

Retinal pathology in albino rats; generation and loss of photors opti the retina of albino rats in the 2-7 Evaluation of the retinas of abba-monkeys, and minipigs did not rea-potential significance of this effect, established, but cannot be discount mechanism that is universally mechanism that is universally disk shedding) may be involved GY).

Events Reported With Dopart Although the events enumerated ported in association with the use velopment program, they are the other dopaminergic drugs. The events, however, is so low that these events at rates similar to dopaminergic therapies, it was single case would have occurre posed to pramipexole in studied

and reported with pramipexole in the clinical development of the control of the c

for Patients: Patients should be instructed to

MAPEX only as prescribed.

thould be informed that hallucinations can occur
the delerly are at a higher risk than younger pa-

is hay develop postural (orthostatic) hypotension, stay develop postural (orthostatic) hypotension, fithout symptoms such as dizziness, nausea, faint-thouts, and sometimes, sweating. Hypotension more frequently during initial therapy, Accordinate should be cautioned against rising rapidly after lying down, especially if they have been doing symptomic processes and especially at the initiation of with MIRAPEX.

swii Mikarex.

swii M patients are taking other CNS depressants in with MIRAPEX.

teratogenic potential of pramipexole has not the teratogenic potential of pramipexole has not the teratogenic potential and better the teratogenic process in humans is limited, patients should be stiff their physicians if they become pregnant prome pregnant during therapy (see PRECAU-

pancy).

I possibility that pramipexole may be excreted

I, patients should be advised to notify their
they intend to breast-feed or are breast-feeding

op nausea, they should be advised that tak with food may reduce the occurre

ts: During the development of MIRAPEX, chnormalities on routine laboratory testing therefore, no specific guidance is offered remonitoring; the practitioner retains responsing how best to monitor the patient in

colops: Carbidopa/levodopa did not influ-cokinetics of pramipexole in healthy volun-ramipexole did not alter the extent of absorp-the elimination of carbidopa/levodopa, al-son increase in levodopa C_{max} by about 40% of T_{max} from 2.5 to 0.5 hours. In althy volunteers (N=11), selegiline did not armacokinetics of pramipexole.

armacokinetics of pramipexole.

pulation pharmacokinetic analysis sugladine is unlikely to alter the oral clearance

(N=64).

stidine, a known inhibitor of renal tubustance, a known inhibitor of renal tubu-panic bases via the cationic transport sys-increase in pramipexole AUC and a 40% (N=12).

control tubu-concid, a known inhibitor of renal tubu-thnic acids via the anionic transporter, did thunce pramipexole pharmacokinetics

talysis suggests that coadministration of truck by the cationic transport system (eg. lan, diluzem, trianterene, verapami, skiniel decreases the oral clearance of the cationic responsibilities and the companion of the cationic responsibilities in the cationic resp 120%, while those secreted by the an-im (eg., cephalosporins, penicillins, indu-ourchiazide, and chlorpropamide) are effect on the oral clearance of pramipex-linities of cytochrome P450 enzyme

Inhibitors of cytochrome P460 enzymes at to affect pramipexole elimination behand appreciably metabolized by these in vitro. Pramipexole does not inhibit A2, CYP2C9, CY2C19, CYP2E1, and of CYP2D6 was observed with an aphalicating that pramipexole will not in the company of th At plasma concentrations observed fol-tommended clinical dose (1.5 mg tid). the mended clinical dose (1.5 mg tid).

the Since pranipexole is a dopamine
that dopamine antagonists, such as

bothiazines, butyrophenones, thioxantimide, may diminish the effectiveness

Interactions: There are no known

in the mg/kg/a was ad: mg/kg/c the AU Pramip of assay tation assay in In rat fe day (5.4 prolonge effects w prolactin

Carcine

tenance Pregnand was given tion was highest c I.5 mg/kg period of sulted in The plasn the AUC i thought to pexole, sin naintenar numana) bryonic los pramipexo no evidenc following a that in hun inhibited in (approxima mg/m² basi and through There are r Because ani tive of hum: pregnancy o tial risk to t Nursing Management of the showed that

It is not kno milk. Because because of the nursing infarmade as to with drug, taking the mother.

Pediatric Use: distric patient
Geriatric Use:
proximately 36 pared with you pexole renal clanal function. half-life from a cal studies, 38 There were no

breast milk o in milk were

in plasma at Other studie

sulted in an i

rats.

ADVERSE EV During the pre-tients with eith were enrolled in duration of their their use of con early disease did during treatmer Parkinson's dise ment. Because the risks for various eral, present adv separately.

ween older an

risk of hallucin

was increased i

Because the cont ing development a confounding of to quately evaluate erse events.

Early Parkinson's In the three doubtients with early observed adverse frequent in the grausea, dizziness, thenia, and halluc Approximately 129 disease and treater